REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 17 and 27-30 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-8, 10-25, 27-39 and 41-47 will be pending in the present application, with claims 1, 17 and 30 being independent. Claims 9, 26 and 40 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesies extended to applicants' representative, Mr. Sung Kim, during a telephone interview conducted on April 26, 2007. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the remarks below.

1.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 30-39 and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action on page 3 asserts that claim 30 recites a system in the preamble only, and that the body of the claim merely contains software components. Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that the claim is a program per se is not directed to statutory subject matter. Although applicants do not agree with these assertions, for purposes of economy of prosecution the body of claim 30 has been amended as discussed during the interview to recite at least one processing unit comprising a renderer. Therefore, claim 30 is directed to statutory subject matter.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 30-39 and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. §101 are respectfully requested.

2.   **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

A.   **Obviousness in view of Emmelman and Pacifici et al.**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 10-19, 21-25, 27-39, and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Emmelmann (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0074634) in view of Pacifici et al. (U.S. Patent 6,230,171). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed during the interview, Emmelmann teaches server side internet/intranet applications that can be created by writing programs or scripts that generate web pages to be sent to a client (see paragraph 5). Emmelmann discloses creating server side internet applications by placing interactive server side components (ISSC) on internet pages. Emmelmann also teaches that an ISSC algorithm can be extended to create a browser based editor that can place ISSCs on pages and to modify their properties, such that during dynamic page generation, scripts are embedded into the page that permit editing of the page itself (see paragraphs 25 and 27). Therefore, Emmelmann explicitly teaches placing ISSCs on internet pages, and embedding scripts into the pages.

However, as discussed during the interview, Emmelmann fails to disclose or suggest the elements of encapsulating code in an external component that may affect a behavior of one or more elements contained in the document while being external to the document, as included in claim 17. Instead, as discussed above, Emmelmann clearly teaches that the ISSCs are placed on internet pages during the generation process.

Additionally, as discussed during the interview, Emmelmann fails to disclose or suggest the elements of wherein code is not included in the document, as included in claim 17. As discussed in the specification of the present application, one benefit achieved by the embodiments of the present application is improved manageability of web pages due to the separation of script from content by adding script-like behavior to an element in a web page via a component that is external to the web page (see page 3, lines 14-22 and page 11, lines 11-15). In contrast, as discussed above, Emmelmann clearly teaches embedding script or code into internet

pages.

Pacifici et al. fails to cure these defects in Emmelmann. The Office Action cites Pacifici et al. to address the claim element of wherein the reference associating the element with the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet. However, Pacifici et al. is silent with respect to teaching or suggesting the elements of encapsulating code in an external component that may affect a behavior of one or more elements contained in the document while being external to the document, and wherein code is not included in the document, as included in claim 17.

Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, the Office Action on page 7 incorrectly asserts that claim 17 indicates that "the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet". If read in context of the entire claim, it is clear that claim 17 is actually claiming that the reference associating the element with the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet, and not that the external component itself is maintained in a cascading style sheet. Pacifici et al., at the sections cited by the Office Action or elsewhere, does not teach or suggest the elements of "the reference associating the element with the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet", as included in claim 17. Instead, Pacifici et al. merely teaches the standard industry definition of a cascading style sheet, which fixes basic appearance parameters such as font sizes and type faces (see col. 9, lines 55-66). The Office Action concedes that Emmelmann fails to teach this element.

Therefore, since Emmelmann and Pacifici et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 17, this claim is allowable. Claims 1 and 30 include elements similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 17. Therefore, since claims 1 and 30 were rejected under the same rationale as claim 17, claims 1 and 30 are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 17.

Claims 2-7 and 10-16 depend from claim 1. Claims 18-19, 21-25 and 27-29 depend from claim 17. Claims 31-39 and 41-47 depend from claim 30. As discussed above, claims 1, 17 and 30 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the features recited therein, claims 2-7, 10-16, 18-

19, 21-25, 27-29, 31-39 and 41-47 are also allowable.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 10-19, 21-25, 27-39 and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

B. Obviousness in view of Emmelman, Pacifici et al. and Kindel

The Office Action rejects claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Emmelmann in view of Pacifici et al. and further in view of Kindel (COM: What Makes it Work). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Emmelmann and Pacifici et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1 and 17. Kindel fails to cure this defect in Emmelmann and Pacifici et al.

The Office Action cites Kindel only to address the elements specifically recited in dependent claims 8 and 20. However, Kindel fails to disclose or suggest the elements of independent claims 1 and 17 as discussed above. Therefore, since Emmelmann, Pacifici et al. and Kindel, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 17, these claims are allowable.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Claim 20 depends from claim 17. As discussed above, claims 1 and 17 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 8 and 20 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

3. Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a

timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

14/15

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: __April 30, 2007__   By: ___/Sung T. Kim/_____

Sung T. Kim, Reg. No.: 45,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone: (703) 647-6574
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

___April 30, 2007___   ___/Kate Marochkina/_____
Date   Signature

___Kate Marochkina_____
Type or Print Name

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/316,897
Attorney Docket Number: 111399.01
Filing Date: May 20, 1999

15/15